## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

**District of New Mexico** 

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V.

**Judgment in a Criminal Case** 

(For **Revocation** of Probation or Supervised Release)

Gerardo Gonzalez-De La Torre

Case Number: 1:09CR01906-001JB

USM Number: 22510-051

Defense Attorney: Roberto Albertorio, Appointed

THE DEFENI	DANT:		
The defendant	t is adjudicated guilty of these violations:		
Violation Number	Nature of Violation	Violation Ended	
1	The defendant committed another federal, st	tate, or local crime. 03-31-2009	
The defendant Act of 1984.	is sentenced as provided in pages 1 through 2 of	this judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform	
☐ The defer	ndant has not violated condition(s) and is discharged	arged as to such violation(s).	
		he United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of costs, and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid.	
		September 4, 2009	
Defendant's Soc. Sec. No.		Date of Imposition of Judgment	
10/22/1956		/s/ James O. Browning	
Defendant's Date of Birth		Signature of Judge	
Calle Ostracion 574 Colonia Puerto Anapra Juarez Chihuahua MX		Honorable James O. Browning United States District Judge	
Defendant's Residence Address		Name and Title of Judge	
,		October 28, 2009	
Defendant's Mailing Address		Date Signed	
County of Res	sidence	_	

## Case 1:09-cr-01906-JB Document 14 Filed 10/28/09 Page 2 of 2

AO 245D (Rev. 12/03) Judgment in a Criminal Case for Revocations

Sheet 2 Imprisonment Judgment Page 2 of 2

Defendant: Gerardo Gonzalez-De La Torre

Case Number: 1:09CR01906-001JB

## **IMPRISONMENT**

The defendant is committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of **6 months**.

Said term shall run concurrent to the sentence imposed in 2:09CR01459 JB.

Although advisory, the Court has considered the Guidelines and, in arriving at its sentence, has taken account of the Guidelines with other sentencing goals. Specifically, the Court has considered the Guidelines` sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of Defendant. The Court believes that the Guidelines` punishment is appropriate for this sort of offense. Therefore, the sentence in this judgment is consistent with a guideline sentence. The Court has considered the kind of sentence and range established by the Guidelines. The Court believes that a sentence of 6 months reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, provides just punishment, affords adequate deterrence, protects the public and effectively provides the Defendant with needed education or vocational training and medical care, and otherwise fully reflects each of the factors embodied in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). The Court also believes the sentence is reasonable. The Court believes the sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act.

	The court makes these recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:	
	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal.  The defendant must surrender to the United States Marshal for this district:  at on  as notified by the United States Marshal.  The defendant must surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons:  before 2 p.m. on  as notified by the United States Marshal  as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Service Office.	
	RETURN	
I have executed this judgment by:		
Defe	ndant delivered onto	
	at with a Certified copy of this judgment.	
	UNITED STATES MARSHAL	
	Deputy United States Marshal	